REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1 and 3-8 are currently being prosecuted. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejections in view of the amendments and remarks as set forth below.

Rejection under 35 USC 112

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner specifically states that the specification does not teach the claimed subject matter of providing a bottom symmetry with the liquid crystal before forming a sealant. In particular, the Examiner states that the Applicants have not disclosed how this is accomplished in order to control the liquid crystal so as to enable the sealant to be applied without mixing with the liquid crystal.

Applicants submit that the technology of "one drop fill-in" is known and has been presented in published articles, such as the Ishihara et al. patent (5,263,888). In this patent, it is disclosed that a supportive sealing member 22 is formed in a periphery region of one substrate 20a, while a liquid crystal 21 is dropped onto the other substrate 20b. With the two substrates being held apart, the substrates are placed within a vacuum chamber of a vacuum assembly apparatus (col. 1, lines 56-61). Also, this reference discloses that a sealing member is formed by a screen-printing process in a

periphery region of the face (col. 4, lines 16-18). It also discloses that a plurality of drops of a mixture consisting of pneumatic liquid crystal and spherical spacers are formed on the electrode face (col. 4, lines 26-29). It also discloses that the drops of liquid crystal/resin mixture are deposited on the substrate by means of a microsyringe as a rectangular array pattern of a fixed number of drops arranged at ten mm intervals (col. 4, lines 33-37). Thus, this reference shows that the sealing member can be formed on one surface of the substrate and liquid crystal is formed on the other surface of the substrate, without mixing the liquid crystal and the sealant when the two substrates are superimposed. Clearly, Applicants submit that since this feature is known in the prior art, that the claims are properly supported.

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner objected to the term "one-drop fill." By way of the present amendment, this claim has been cancelled, rendering this rejection moot.

Allowable Subject Matter

In the Examiner's Office Action, the Examiner did not reject any of the claims in view of the prior art, but only rejected these claims under 35 USC § 112. Since the Examiner's rejections under 35 USC § 112 have been overcome for the above reasons, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance.

Favorable reconsideration and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that the claims now meet the requirements of 35 USC 112. In view of this, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all of the claims are now requested.

In the event that any outstanding matters remain in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: May 25, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
for Joe McKinney Muncy #43,368
Registration No.: 32,334
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Rd
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant

KM/asc